

REMARKSRECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested. **MAR 30 2007**

Claims 1-24 are pending. Claims 1, 2, 4-13, 15-18, 20, 21, 23 and 24 have been rejected.

Claims 3, 14, 19 and 22 have been objected to.

Claims 1, 6, 15, and 20 have been amended. Claims 3, 14, 19, and 22 have been canceled. No claims have been added. Support for the amendments is found in the specification, the drawings, and in the claims as originally filed. Applicant submits that the amendments do not add new matter.

Drawing Objections

The Examiner has objected to **Fig. 4** for failing to comply with 37 C.F.R. §1.84(p)-(5) because they include reference characters 432, 434, and 440 not mentioned in the description.

The previously presented paragraph [0032] has been amended to include reference characters 432 and 434.

With respect to the objection that reference numeral 440 is not mentioned in the description, applicant respectfully submits that reference numeral 440 is described in the previously presented paragraph [0032] that reads as follows:

Figure 4 shows a RAT 418 that includes three component RATs: - a high-bandwidth RAT 422, a mid-bandwidth RAT 424, and a low-bandwidth RAT 426. As shown in **Figure 4**, trace cache 410 is coupled to RAT 418. Re-scheduler 440 is coupled to RAT 418, as shown in Figure 4. The high-bandwidth RAT 422 and low-bandwidth RAT 426 are shown with the corresponding number of read ports 428, 436, respectively, and write ports 430, 438, respectively, as used by the high-bandwidth RAT 222 and low-bandwidth RAT 224 of **Figure 2**. However, in other embodiments other numbers of read ports and write ports may be used. The mid-bandwidth RAT 424 may have a number of read ports and a number of write ports somewhere between that used by the high-bandwidth RAT 422 and the low-bandwidth RAT 426. In the **Figure 4** embodiment, mid-bandwidth RAT 424 is shown with N read ports and $N/2$ write ports, although other numbers could be chosen.

(emphasis added)

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's objections to drawing of Fig. 4 have been overcome.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-2 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,758,112 to Yeager, et al. ("Yeager").

Applicant has amended claim 1 and canceled claim 3 to include a pipeline logic to stall a pipeline when a first instruction utilizes more logical register addresses from said second set than said second number.

Thus, claim 1 now includes the limitations of claim 3 and is now allowable as the Examiner indicated that claim 3 was allowable. Rather than rewriting claim 3, Applicant has amended claim 1.

Because claim 2 depends from amended claim 1 and add additional limitations, applicant respectfully submit that claim 2 is not anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) by Yeager.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 4-13, 15-18, 20-21 and 23-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yeager.

Amended claim 1, which includes the limitation of claim 3, is now allowable as the Examiner indicated that claim 3 was allowable.

Applicant has amended claim 6 and canceled claim 14 to include stalling a pipeline when a first number of logical register addresses is supplied to said second register alias table, and said first number is greater than a second number of read ports of said second register alias table.

Thus, claim 6 now includes the limitations of claim 14 and is now allowable as the Examiner indicated that claim 14 was allowable. Rather than rewriting claim 14, Applicant has amended claim 6.

Applicant has amended claim 15 and canceled claim 19 to include means for stalling a pipeline when a first number of logical register addresses is supplied to said second register alias table, and said first number is greater than a second number of read ports of said second register alias table.

Thus, claim 15 now includes the limitations of claim 19 and is now allowable as the Examiner indicated that claim 19 was allowable. Rather than rewriting claim 19, Applicant has amended claim 15.

Applicant has amended claim 20 and canceled claim 22 to include a pipeline logic to stall a pipeline when a first instruction utilizes more logical register addresses from said second set than said second number.

Thus, claim 20 now includes the limitations of claim 22 and is now allowable as the Examiner indicated that claim 22 was allowable. Rather than rewriting claim 22, Applicant has amended claim 20.

Because claims 4-5, 7-13, 16-18, 21, and 23-34 depend from amended independent claims 1, 6, 15, and 20 respectively, applicant respectfully submit that claims 4-5, 7-13, 16-18, 21, and 23-34 are also allowable.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAR 30 2007

Allowable subject matter

Applicant notes with appreciation the Examiner's allowance of the claims 3, 14, 19 and 22 if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicant has herewith amended the claims in light of this suggestion.


Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that in view of the amendments and arguments set forth herein, the applicable rejections and objections have been overcome. If a telephone interview would in any way expedite the allowance of the present application, the Examiner is invited to contact Tatiana Rossin at (408)-720-8300. If there are any additional charges, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any fee deficiency that may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: March 30, 2007

By: 
Tatiana Rossin
Reg.No.56,833

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025
(408) 720-8300
Fax (408) 720-8383